

REMARKS*General Remarks*

Claims 1, 6, 9, 13, 15, 19, and 22 have been amended. Claims 25-30 have been added. Claims 1-30 are therefore present for consideration in this application. The amendments and the new claims are fully supported by the specification and drawings as originally filed, and no new matter has been added.

The present claims are directed toward delay elements that allow the movement of edges relative to other edges, the movement of a series of edges all at once, or the adjustment of the delay of one of the edges without impacting the other edges, or the adjustment of relative timing of edges relative to each other. The network of delay elements is designed to move on edge, a series of edges relative to one another, or to move the duration of single signals relative to each other, with or without relativity. The present claims allow for the movement of one of the edges or a width of a signal by itself without impacting other edges, or allow for movement of the width of that signal and as a result any signal that was relative to the edge of that signal.

In contrast, the prior art discusses and discloses only the changing of duration of a single pulse, without any teaching or suggestion of relativity as required by the claims as amended.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 11-12 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Churchill et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,977). Applicant submits that the amended claims 1, 9, and 15 contain elements not found in Churchill et al. Claims 1 and 9 as amended recite a delay element that adjusts one of an edge position of at least one signal relative to other edges, a plurality of edge positions relative to other edges, or a duration of a single signal relative to other signals. Claim 15 recites selecting an edge position in response to the programmed non-volatile fuse circuit.

Claims 2-5, 10-12, and 16-18 depend from and further define patentably distinct claims 1, 9, or 15, and are also believed allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 4, 6-8, 10, 13-14 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Churchill et al. in view of Bishop et al. (U.S. Patent 6,219,813). applicant submits that the amended claims 6, 13, 19, and 22 contain elements not present in either Churchill et al., Bishop et al., or any combination thereof. Specifically, claims 6 and 13 recite a plurality of set/reset flip-flops triggered off of a signal edge or a certain number of delay elements and reset by other edges or numbers of delay elements, which is not present in either of the references, nor is it suggested by any combination thereof. Claim 19 as amended recites selecting an edge position in response to the programmed non-volatile fuse circuit. Claim 22 as amended recites providing an edge position for edges of signals.


Claims 7-8, 14, 20-21, and 23-30 depend from and further define patentably distinct claims 6, 13, 19, or 22, and are also believed allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, please contact the under-signed at (612) 312-2203.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6 Oct 2003



Daniel J. Polglaze
Reg. No. 39,801

Attorneys for Applicant
Leffert Jay & Polglaze, P.A.
P.O. Box 581009
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009
Phn: (612) 312-2200
Fax: (612) 312-2250